

## REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on February 9, 2006. Claim 1 has been amended and claims 1-3 and 5-7 remain pending in the present application. Applicant appreciates the courtesy extended by Examiner Osman during the telephone interview conducted on March 31, 2006. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in complete condition for allowance and request reconsideration of the application in this regard.

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Papadopoulos et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,282,454 in view of Baker et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,696,898. While Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 as discussed during the telephone interview to more sharply define the claimed invention over the prior art of record and respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claim 1, and claims depending therefrom, be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 5, and claims depending therefrom, for the reasons discussed during the telephone interview and respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

During the telephone interview, Applicant's counsel and Examiner discussed the pending claims in view of the Papadopoulos et al. and Baker et al. references. As discussed with Examiner, Baker et al. is directed to a system that allows a network administrator to restrict users from accessing the public network (100) based upon the terminal identification code of the user terminals (107-109). Baker et al. performs this "filtering" function through the use of a proxy server (112) within the user's local network that determines which URLs requested by a particular user terminal (107-109) may be transmitted to the public network (100) for accessing a particular network

resource (101-105). In the system of Baker et al., and contrary to Examiner's position set forth on Page 4 of the Office Action, the proxy server (112) is not the web server that publishes the web pages requested by the user. Rather, the requested web pages are published by the web servers of the network resources (101-105) (see Col. 3, lines 4-16).

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite that the network address of the user is identified at the web server that publishes the plurality of web screens to clearly distinguish over the prior art of record. Independent claim 5 presently recites that the web server publishes a plurality of web screens on the network and that the network address of a user accessing the web server is identified through program code running on the web server and so this distinguishing feature is presently recited in independent claim 5.

Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the web interface of Papadopoulos et al. to include the "filtering" feature of Baker et al. since such a modification would completely ignore the intended purpose and function of the Baker et al. system to operate in a user's local network to determine which URLs requested by a particular user terminal may be transmitted to the public network for accessing a particular network resource. Applicant respectfully submits that the system of Baker et al. particularly functions to control access to the public network based upon the terminal identification code of a user's terminal and so would not be considered to replace the password and user list access control of Papadopoulos et al. which is provided at the web server to provide security for various pages at the site (see Col 4, lines 14-21). Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that the hypothetical combination of Baker et al. and Papadopoulos et al. is improper

and, in any event, fails to achieve the combination of elements or steps recited in each of independent claims 1 and 5 and the rejections should be withdrawn.

Moreover, as claims 2, 3, 6 and 7 depend from allowable independent claims 1 and 5, and further as each of these claims recites a combination of elements or steps not taught or suggested by the prior art of record, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable as well.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing response including the amendments and remarks, this application is submitted to be in complete condition for allowance and early notice to this affect is earnestly solicited. If there is any issue that remains which may be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to resolve the same and expedite the allowance of this application.

Applicant does not believe that this response requires that any fees be submitted, however, if any fees are deemed necessary, these may be charged to Deposit Account No. 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

/David H. Brinkman/

David H. Brinkman

Reg. No. 40,532

2700 Carew Tower  
441 Vine Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
(513) 241-2324 - Voice  
(513) 421-7269 – Facsimile